RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 08 2007

REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 5-8 and 49-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 has been cancelled. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 has been amended to overcome the rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 49-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 has been amended to overcome the rejection.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection – Kim

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 5-8 and 49-53 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by either U.S. Patent No. 5,182,394 issued to Kim (hereinafter "Kim") or U.S. Patent No. 6,338,902 issued to Hsu et al. (hereinafter "Hsu").

Claim 2 pertains to a composition comprising:

"a compound comprising:
at least one epoxy group;
at least one liquid crystalline disrupting moiety;
a melting point temperature of the compound that is less than 140°C; and
liquid crystallinity of the compound at a temperature greater than 150°C; and

*a **filler** having a coefficient of thermal expansion that is closer to a coefficient of thermal expansion of silicon than to a coefficient of thermal expansion of an epoxy medium in which the filler is employed*".

Neither Kim nor Hsu teaches or suggests these limitations. In particular, neither Kim nor Hsu teaches or suggests: (1) that the claimed compound include the at least one liquid crystalline **disrupting moiety**; and (2) that the claimed compound be included in a composition with the claimed **filler** having the claimed **coefficient of thermal expansion**.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 requires every element of the claimed invention be identically shown in a single prior art reference. The Federal Circuit has indicated that the standard for measuring lack of novelty by anticipation is strict identity. "*For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. Section 102, **every element** (emphasis added) of the claimed invention must be **identically** (emphasis added) shown in a single reference.*" In Re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Accordingly, claim 2 is not anticipated by either Kim or Hsu. Accordingly, claim 2 and its dependent claims are believed to be allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the cited art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed at the earliest possible date.

Request For Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call Brent E. Vecchia at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request For An Extension Of Time

The Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 for such an extension.

Charge Our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: June 8, 2007

By Brent E. Vecchia

Brent E. Vecchia, Reg. No. 48,011
Tel.: (303) 740-1980 (Mountain Time)

Attachments

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025